

This Page is Inserted by IIFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record

## BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IIFW Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,929	01/11/2001	yasuoki Tanaka	F-6723	9618

7590 10/05/2004

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, NY 10168

EXAMINER

HO, THE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/758,929

Applicant(s)

TANAKA, YASUOKI

Examiner

The Thanh Ho

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2004.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 6/18/2004.
2. Claims 4-6 have been examined and are pending in the application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The following terms lack antecedent basis:

- (i) "said object data" (line 3 claim 5). Correction is required.

B. The applicant recites "User control system according to claim 1" on line 1 of claim 5, which is an inappropriate dependent because claim 1 had been cancelled. Correction is required.

C. The applicant recites "User control system according to claim 2" on line 1 of claim 6, which is an inappropriate dependent because claim 2 had been cancelled. Correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 2126

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki U.S Patent No. 6,385,636 in view of Landsman U.S Patent No. 6,687,737.

**As to claim 4**, Suzuki teaches a system comprising a user control unit (components of clients node 14, Fig. 3, line 36 column 7) comprising:

an input/output managing unit (task request part 144, line 55 column 7) for conducting input/output processing of a standardized user-side data form (manipulation data indicating the requested task, line 53 column 7), capable of being displayed in an alternative plurality of modes on a screen (the acquired result of the task is displayed in a monitor device, lines 20-21 column 3; www browser of the client node, lines 3-4 column 3);

a keyboard for data entry (user manipulation of an input device such as a keyboard and a mouse, lines 51-52 column 7);

an object datum (manipulation data indicating the requested task, line 53 column 7), comprising a plurality of elements, which is to be input/output processed and registered and managed in a server (the request being generated and send to the server node 12, lines 56-59 column 7);

a data exchange control unit (reception processing part 146 and send processing part 154, Fig. 3, lines 58-59 column 7) for exchanging data and processing a request (request for processing being sent from 154, Fig. 3, lines 58-59 column 7) and a response (receives and analyzes data received from the server node 12, lines 61-62 column 7) respectively by and between said user (client node 14, line 36 column 7) and said server (server node 12, line 58 column 7);

wherein said processing of a response (receives and analyzes data received from the server node 12, lines 61-62 column 7) is separated into:

an input/output definition command (result of a database search task, lines 63-64 column 7) for routine input/output processing by said input/output managing unit (task request part 144, line 55 column 7), and a datum definition command (received data is an application program, line 66 column 7) for defining said object datum (lines 66-67 column 7). Suzuki does not explicitly teach printer for printing, cache control and an object data managing unit.

Landsman teaches a client/server system (Fig. 1B) of requesting advertising content within an applet (lines 58-60 column 9) comprising a printer for printing (printer 385, Fig. 3); wherein an applet agent (AdController agent which is a Java applet, lines 59-60 column 16) from the server (HTTP server, line 56 column 16) is being sent to the client and being cached within the client browser (lines 60-63 column 16) so whenever the client execute the ad applet, the request for ad content within the applet is being sent to the AdController agent in the client browser for processing without going to the server (lines 1-4 column 17); an object data managing unit (Applet registry, line 37

Art Unit: 2126

column 20) for sharing and managing (a mechanism for inter-applet communication, lines 37-38 column 20) object datum (Transition sensor and AdController applets, line 39 column 20) so that reference to and update of the object datum is enabled (the latest version of the applets being downloaded, lines 30-33 column 20) in response to a command (browser determines, line 23 column 20). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Landsman to the system of Suzuki because this increases the rate of processing a request since the request can be executed locally by the control agent that was sent from the server and was cached within the client system.

**As to claim 5**, Landsman further teaches operation definitions defining the operation processing (extends standard applet class definitions by overriding initialize, start, run, stop and destroy life cycle methods, lines 4-6 column 24) between elements of object data (all other objects, line 2 column 24), an object data operating unit (AdController applet, line 1 column 24) for conducting an operation processing between the elements of object datum in response to the operation definition (lines 1-15 column 24).

**As to claim 6**, Landsman further teaches a dependence relation managing unit Transition Sensor applet, line 65 column 27) for rearranging the order of operations depending upon the dependence relations (advertisement are started in the order specified in the file, lines 4-5 column 28) between the data items based upon the operation definitions (line 64 column 27 to line 14 column 28), such that object data operating unit (AdController applet, line 1 column 24) conducts the operations in accordance with the rearranged order (at the inception of an interstitial interval, signaled

by a Transition Sensor stop event, the AdController applet interstitially plays an advertisement that has then been completely queued, lines 64-67 column 27).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 6/18/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that the cited references do not teach the limitations of claims 4-6 (Remarks, second and third complete paragraphs page 11). In response, claims 4-6 are new claims. However, the limitations of these new claims are still met by the cited references as disclosed in the claim rejections above.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.



Art Unit: 2126

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to The Thanh Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872 - 9306.
- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872 - 9306.
- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 – 3762

TTH

September 29, 2004

  
MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100